

## 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Nursing Research Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 11:54:26 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

### 2. Fiscal Year

2018

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Institute of Nursing Research Special Emphasis  
Panel

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

2086

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

09/29/1995

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear

Continue

### 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

### 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

### 11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

### 12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 USC 282(b)(16)

### 13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

### 14. Committee Type

Continuing

### 14c. Presidential?

No

### 15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

### 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this  
FiscalYear

### 17a. Open 0 17b. Closed 13 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 13

### Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
NIH Peer Review	10/11/2017	- 10/11/2017
NIH Peer Review	10/12/2017	- 10/12/2017
NIH Peer Review	10/16/2017	- 10/16/2017
NIH Peer Review	11/03/2017	- 11/03/2017
NIH Peer Review	11/07/2017	- 11/07/2017
NIH Peer Review	11/17/2017	- 11/17/2017
NIH Peer Review	02/05/2018	- 02/05/2018
NIH Peer Review	02/21/2018	- 02/21/2018
NIH Peer Review	02/27/2018	- 02/27/2018
NIH Peer Review	03/05/2018	- 03/06/2018
NIH Peer Review	03/26/2018	- 03/26/2018
NIH Peer Review	06/06/2018	- 06/06/2018
NIH Peer Review	09/28/2018	- 09/28/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 13

Current FY Next FY

<b>18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$24,200.00	\$24,200.00
<b>18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff</b>	\$508,094.00	\$534,078.00
<b>18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$51,093.00	\$51,962.00
<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$23,143.00	\$23,536.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$606,530.00	\$633,776.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	3.20	3.40

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. Operations of this committee are accomplished using a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. During this reporting period a group of panels reviewed a total of 57 grant applications requesting \$109,212,386. One panel also reviewed 5 Loan Repayment Applications.

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

This Committee has a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to evaluate grant applications and contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications and contracts requiring review.

**20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?**

The Panel held 13 meetings during this reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this Committee structure has proved both efficient and effective.

**20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?**

This Committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications

and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

## **20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?**

The meetings of the National Institute of Nursing Research Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and contract proposals. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

## **21. Remarks**

Reports: This committee did not produce any reports during this fiscal year. Website: This committee does not have a dedicated website. DFO/Committee Decision Maker: The DFO and Committee Decision Maker positions are held by the same individual based on the assignment of duties in this Institute. Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

## **Designated Federal Officer**

Weiqun Li Chief, Office of Review

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>End</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Member Designation</b>
ACIERNO, RONALD	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
AMELLA, ELAINE	11/03/2017	11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ANCES, BEAU	03/26/2018	03/26/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ANDERSON, RUTH	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
BADR, HODA	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BAKKEN, SUZANNE	11/03/2017	11/03/2017	ALUMNI PROFESSOR OF NURSING	Peer Review Consultant Member
BARR, PAUL	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

BATTLE, CYNTHIA	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BERRY, DIANE	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BORCKARDT, JEFFREY	06/06/2018	06/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BOUSTANI, MALAZ	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	RICHARD M FAIRBANKS PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BULLOCK, LINDA	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR EMERITUS	Peer Review Consultant Member
CATZ, SHERYL	11/17/2017	11/17/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COLON-EMERIC, CATHLEEN	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
COMPTON, PEGGY	06/06/2018	06/06/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CORBETT, CINDY	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CORWIN, ELIZABETH	02/05/2018	02/05/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH	Peer Review Consultant Member
DALY, BARBARA	11/03/2017	11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DAMPIER, CARLTON	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	DIRECTOR, PED. SICKLE CELL PROG.	Peer Review Consultant Member
DOORENBOS, ARDITH	06/06/2018	06/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DORSEY, SUSAN	11/07/2017	11/07/2017	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ELLINGTON, LEE	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
EMANUEL, LINDA	11/03/2017	11/03/2017	BUEHLER PROFESSOR OF GERIATRIC MEDICINE AND DIRECTOR OF THE BUEHLER CENTER ON AGING	Peer Review Consultant Member
ERLEN, JUDITH	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ESCOBAR, GABRIEL	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PHYSICIAN & RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
FARLEY, JASON	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

FEDERMAN, ALEX	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
FOSTER, TERRAH	02/21/2018	02/21/2018	Consultant	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
FOWKE, JAY	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
GREEN, BARRY	11/07/2017	11/07/2017	FELLOW AND PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HERR, KEELA	03/26/2018	03/26/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR FACULTY	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HICKEY, KATHLEEN	02/21/2018	02/21/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HINDS, PAMELA	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	DIRECTOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HIRSHFIELD, SABINA	11/17/2017	11/17/2017	SENIOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HOLSTAD, MARCIA	02/21/2018	02/21/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HOUGH, CATHERINE	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HUANG, JEANNIE	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
HUI, DAVID	11/03/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
JACELON, CYNTHIA	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
JACKSON, ELIZABETH	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
JOHNSON, HEATHER	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
JULION, WRENETHA	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
KALICHMAN, SETH	11/17/2017	11/17/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
KEENAN, KATHRYN	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member
KELLER, COLLEEN	03/26/2018	03/26/2018	PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review
				Consultant
				Member

KNEIPP, SHAWN	03/26/2018 03/26/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KOPELOWICZ, ALEX	10/16/2017 10/16/2017	PROFESSOR AND VICE CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KRAVITZ, RICHARD	02/27/2018 02/27/2018	PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KWEKKEBOOM, KRISTINE	09/28/2018 09/28/2018	LILLIAN S. MOEHLMAN BASCOM PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LEE, SIMON	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LENNIE, TERRY	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, PHD STUDIES	Peer Review Consultant Member
LEVY, RONA	06/06/2018 06/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LIM, ANDREW	02/21/2018 02/21/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND CLINICIAN SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
LYON, DEBRA	10/16/2017 10/16/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LYON, MAUREEN	02/21/2018 02/21/2018	RESEARCH PROFESSOR & PSYCHOBIOLOGIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
MACK, JENNIFER	10/12/2017 10/12/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MAHONEY, JANE	09/28/2018 09/28/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MA, JUN	09/28/2018 09/28/2018	PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCCARTHY, ANN MARIE	09/28/2018 09/28/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCEVOY, CYNTHIA	02/05/2018 02/05/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MELAMED, MICHAL	10/16/2017 10/16/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MIASKOWSKI, CHRISTINE	11/07/2017 11/07/2017	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MITCHELL, PAMELA	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MITRANI, VICTORIA	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH	Peer Review Consultant Member

MOONEY, KATHLEEN	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AND CO-LEADER OF CANCER CONTROL AND POPULATION SCIENCE PROGRAM	Peer Review Consultant Member
MUNGER, STEVEN	11/07/2017 11/07/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
NESS, KIRSTEN	06/06/2018 06/06/2018	FULL MEMBER	Peer Review Consultant Member
NOLAN, MARIE	11/03/2017 11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PAASCHE-ORLOW, MICHAEL	11/03/2017 11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PADDON-JONES, DOUGLAS	02/05/2018 02/05/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PAGE, KATHLEEN	11/07/2017 11/07/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
PARKER, LESLIE	10/11/2017 10/11/2017	CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PRIGERSON, HOLLY	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PULLEN, CAROL	10/11/2017 10/11/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
REID, MANNEY	11/03/2017 11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RENN, CYNTHIA	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RHEE, HYEKYUN	06/06/2018 06/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SANTACROCE, SHEILA	09/28/2018 09/28/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SAWIN, KATHLEEN	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	PROFESSOR EMERITA	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHIFFMAN, RACHEL	03/05/2018 03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCOTT-SHELDON, LORI	06/06/2018 06/06/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SEROVICH, JULIANNE	11/17/2017 11/17/2017	PROFESSOR AND DEAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHARPS, PHYLLIS	02/27/2018 02/27/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN	Peer Review Consultant Member

SHYU, CHI-REN	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	DIRECTOR AND SHUMAKER PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SIBILLE, KIMBERLY	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SIMINERIO, LINDA	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SONG, LIXIN	02/27/2018	02/27/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SONG, MI-KYUNG	10/12/2017	10/12/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STARKWEATHER, ANGELA	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STEIN, KAREN	03/26/2018	03/26/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STONE, PATRICIA	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	CENTENNIAL PROFESSOR IN HEALTH POLICY AND DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR HEALTH POLICY	Peer Review Consultant Member
TITLER, MARITA	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	RHETAUGH G. DUMAS ENDOWED PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WEISS, SANDRA	09/28/2018	09/28/2018	PROFESSOR AND ESCHBACH ENDOWED CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WHITE, DOUGLAS	02/21/2018	02/21/2018	UPMC ENDOWED CHAIR AND PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WILKIE, DIANA	11/03/2017	11/03/2017	PRAIRIEVIEW TRUST-EARL AND MARGO POWERS ENDOWED PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WILLIAMS, KRISTINE	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	E. JEAN HILL PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WYATT, GWEN	02/27/2018	02/27/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZAUSZNIEWSKI, JACLENE	02/21/2018	02/21/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHANG, AMY	03/05/2018	03/06/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 99**

### **Narrative Description**

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The



NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary... shall by regulations require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts...

**What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Trust in government                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Major policy changes                              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Advance in scientific research                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery                         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Increased customer satisfaction                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Other   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Outcome Comments**

NA

**What are the cost savings associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

- |                            |                                     |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Under \$100,000            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Over \$10,000,000          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Cost Savings Other         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Cost Savings Comments**

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

**What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee**

**for the life of the committee?**

1,700

**Number of Recommendations Comments**

Grant Review

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?**

0%

**% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments**

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?**

0%

**% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments**

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

**Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?**

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒

## Agency Feedback Comments

Special Emphasis Panels have a fluid membership and only meet once. Also, the results of these meetings are highly confidential and no feedback is warranted.

## What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities

☐

Reallocated resources

☐

Issued new regulation

☐

Proposed legislation

☐

Approved grants or other payments

☐

Other

☐

## Action Comments

An action of approved or recommended for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

## Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 57

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 57

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$109,212,386

## Grant Review Comments

NA

## How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO



Online Agency Web Site



Online Committee Web Site



Online GSA FACA Web Site



Publications



Other



### **Access Comments**

NA